UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,960	04/17/2000	Richard C. Levine	065581.0105	1648

7590   11/30/2004

Baker Botts LLP
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201

EXAMINER
WOO, RICHARD SUKYOON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 August 2004*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-168* is/are pending in the application.
      4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-168* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
      Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
      Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
      a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
      * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1)   The applicant's amendment filed August 31, 2004 has been entered.

2)   Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last

Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

3)   The indicated allowability of claims of the last Office Action is withdrawn in view

of the newly discovered reference(s) to *infra* Sansone (US 6,549,892). Rejections

based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4)   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5)   Claims 1-38, 41-42, 54-55, 77-127, and 155-168 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and

distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In Claim 1, lines 9-10, the recitation of "an optics processing environment, a

magnetic processing environment, and a physics-based processing environment"

renders the claim indefinite because it is not clear how the described environment is

organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative

invention. The cancellation these processing environments from the claim is

respectfully solicited by the examiner.

Claims 77, 101, and 155, respectively, suffer the identical indefiniteness.

In Claims 15-16, 54-55, 107-108, and 134, the notion that the first address is compatible with the second address if the first address matches the (part of) second address is indefinite because it is not clear how the object can be delivered if the original address and the destination address are same.

Claims suffer the same indefiniteness as above.

In Claim 3, line 2; Claim 41-42, lines 1-3; Claims 160-161, lines 1-3, respectively, the recitation of "substituting the third address for the first address" renders the claim indefinite because it is not clear how the applicant substitutes the forwarding destination address for the originating address.

Claims 79-80 suffer the similar indefiniteness as recited above.

Claim Objections

6) Claims 39-76 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In Claim 39, line 15, ";" (before ".") should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8)   Claims 1-2, 5-11, 13-14, 17-20, 28-29, 31-32, 36-40, 43-49, 51-53, 56-58, 62, 66-67, 69-70, 74-78, 81-82, 86-94, 97, 100-106, 109, 113, 117-118, 120-121, 125-133, 135-136, 144-145, 147-148, 152-159, and 162-168, as far as they are definite, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sansone (US 6,549,892).

As for Claim 1, Sansone discloses a method comprising:

storing a first address and a first functional property code associated with a first point (see Figs. 4 and 7; col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line 56; col. 7, line 48 – col. 9, line 9);

storing a second functional property code, a second address and a third address associated with a second point (see Id.);

determining if the first address is compatible with the second address (see Id.);

determining if the first functional property code is compatible with the second functional property code if the first and second addresses are compatible (see Supra Figs. and columns); and

sending the third address (e.g. forwarding address) to the first point if the first functional property code is compatible with the second one (see Id.).

As for Claim 2: Sansone further discloses the method including routing an object to the second point (destination) based on the third address (forwarding address).

As for Claim 5: Sansone further discloses the method including retrieving an object from the second point based on the third address (in case the object was sent to the former address, it must be inherently retrieved and forwarded to the new forwarding address).

As for Claim 6: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the second address includes a partial postal address.

As for Claim 7: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the second address is compatible with the third address.

As for Claim 8: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first address includes part of the second address (in case the first and second address are both in the same city).

As for Claim 9: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the third address includes a pseudo-address (e.g. mailroom number in Supra columns).

As for Claim 10: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first point includes an origin point (see Supra columns).

As for Claim 11: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the second point includes the destination point (see Id.).

As for Claim 13: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the database is remote from the first point (see Figs.).

As for Claim 14: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the database includes a processor and a memory (see Id.).

As for Claim 17: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first functional property code (Unique code in Sansone) is compatible with the second functional code if the first functional property code matches the second functional property code.

As for Claim 18: Sansone further discloses the method including storing the first functional property code at the first point.

As for Claim 19: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first point is operable to modify the first functional property code before sending the first functional property code to the database (see Supra columns).

As for Claim 20: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the modifying includes substituting another code for the first code.

As for Claim 28: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the database stores a second functional property code, a second address, and a third address for each of a plurality of second points (e.g. a corporation mailroom).

As for Claim 29: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein determining the compatibility includes determining if the first address is compatible with any of the second address.

As for Claim 31: Sansone further discloses the method including storing, at the database, at least one additional functional property code associated with the second point (e.g. a corporation mailroom).

As for Claim 32: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first functional property code is compatible with the second functional property code if the first code is compatible with the at least one of the second codes.

As for Claim 36: Sansone further discloses the method including obtaining and sending

at least one additional functional property code associated with the first address, such

that the first address has multiple associated first functional property codes (see Supra

multiple second points).

As for Claim 37: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first functional

property code is compatible with the second code if each of the functional codes is

compatible with at least one of the second codes.

As for Claim 38: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the transportation

network is a parcel delivery network.

As for Claim 39, Sansone discloses a system comprising:

a first point operable to obtain and send a first address and a first functional

property code;

a processor coupled to the first point, the processor programmed to:

store a second functional property code in database, a second address and a third

address associated with the second point (see Figs. 4 and 7; col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line

56; col. 7, line 48 – col. 9, line 9);

receive from the database the first address and the first functional property code;

determine if the first address is compatible with the second address (see Id.);

determine if the first functional property code is compatible with the second

functional property code if the first and second addresses are compatible (see Supra

Figs. and columns); and

send the third address (e.g. forwarding address) to the first point if the first

functional property code is compatible with the second one (see Id.).

As for Claim 40: Sansone further discloses the system including routing an object to the

second point (destination) based on the third address (forwarding address).

As for Claim 43: Sansone further discloses the system including retrieving an object

from the second point based on the third address (in case the object was sent to the

former address, it must be inherently retrieved and forwarded to the new forwarding

address).

As for Claim 44: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the second address

includes a partial postal address.

As for Claim 45: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the second address is

compatible with the third address.

As for Claim 46: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first address

includes part of the second address (in case the first and second address are both in

the same city).

As for Claim 47: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the third address

includes a pseudo-address (e.g. mailroom number in Supra columns).

As for Claim 48: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first point includes

an origin point (see Supra columns).

As for Claim 49: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the second point

includes the destination point (see Id.).

As for Claim 51: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the database is remote from the first point (see Figs.).

As for Claim 52: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the database includes a processor and a memory (see Id.).

As for Claim 53: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first functional property code (Unique code in Sansone) is compatible with the second functional code if the first functional property code matches the second functional property code.

As for Claim 56: Sansone further discloses the system including storing the first functional property code at the first point.

As for Claim 57: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first point is operable to modify the first functional property code before sending the first functional property code to the database (see Supra columns).

As for Claim 58: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the modifying includes substituting another code for the first code.

As for Claim 62: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the database is operable to determine if the first code is compatible with the third code if the first code is incompatible with the second code.

As for Claim 66: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the database stores a second functional property code, a second address, and a third address for each of a plurality of second points (e.g. a corporation mailroom).

As for Claim 67: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein determining the compatibility includes determining if the first address is compatible with any of the second address.

As for Claim 69: Sansone further discloses the system including storing, at the database, at least one additional functional property code associated with the second point (e.g. a corporation mailroom).

As for Claim 70: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first functional property code is compatible with the second functional property code if the first code is compatible with the at least one of the second codes.

As for Claim 74: Sansone further discloses the system including obtaining and sending at least one additional functional property code associated with the first address, such that the first address has multiple associated first functional property codes (see Supra multiple second points).

As for Claim 75: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first functional property code is compatible with the second code if each of the functional codes is compatible with at least one of the second codes.

As for Claim 76: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the transportation network is a parcel delivery network.

As for Claim 77, Sansone discloses a method comprising:

obtaining a first address and a first functional property code associated with a

first point (see Figs. 4 and 7; col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line 56; col. 7, line 48 – col. 9, line

9);

communicating the first address and the first code;

determining if the first address is compatible with the second address (see Id.);

determining if the first functional property code is compatible with the second

functional property code if the first and second addresses are compatible (see Supra

Figs. and columns); and

receiving the second address (e.g. forwarding address); and

facilitating routing an object from a location to a destination based at least one

the second address (see Id.).

As for Claim 78: Sansone further discloses the method including routing an object to the

second point (destination) based on the second address (forwarding address).

As for Claim 81: Sansone further discloses the method wherein facilitating routing

includes selecting a network node to which to route the object (each delivery carrier

inherently must select the delivery network node to route the object).

As for Claim 82: Sansone further discloses the method including facilitating retrieval of

the object from the second point based on the second address.

As for Claim 86: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the second address

includes a partial postal address.

As for Claim 87: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the third address includes a pseudo-address (e.g. mailroom number in Supra columns).

As for Claim 88: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first point includes an origin point (see Supra columns).

As for Claim 89: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the second point includes the destination point (see Id.).

As for Claim 90: Sansone further discloses the method including storing the first functional property code at the first point.

As for Claim 91: Sansone further discloses the method including modifying the first code before communicating the first code.

As for Claim 92: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the modifying the first code includes substituting another code for the first code.

As for Claim 93: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the modifying the first code includes adding another code to the first code.

As for Claim 94: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein obtaining a first address and a first code includes generating the code based on automated optical recognition the object (scanner).

As for Claim 97: Sansone further discloses the method including obtaining and communicating at least one additional code associated with the first address.

As for Claim 100: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the transportation network is a parcel delivery network.

As for Claim 101, Sansone discloses a method comprising:

receiving and storing a first address and a first functional property code

associated with a first point (see Figs. 4 and 7; col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line 56; col. 7, line

48 – col. 9, line 9);

storing a second functional property code, a second address and a third address

associated with a second point (see Id.);

determining if the first address is compatible with the second address (see Id.);

determining if the first functional property code is compatible with the second

functional property code if the first and second addresses are compatible (see Supra

Figs. and columns); and

generating the third address (e.g. forwarding address) to the first point if the first

functional property code is compatible with the second one (see Id.).

As for Claim 102: Sansone further discloses the method wherein the second address

includes a partial address.

As for Claim 103: Sansone further discloses the method wherein the second address

matches the third address.

As for Claim 104: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first address

includes part of the second address (in case the first and second address are both in

the same city).

As for Claim 105 Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the third address

includes a pseudo-address (e.g. mailroom number in Supra columns).

As for Claim 106: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the second point includes the destination point (see Id.).

As for Claim 109: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first functional property code (Unique code in Sansone) is compatible with the second functional code if the first functional property code matches the second functional property code.

As for Claim 113: Sansone further discloses the method determining if the first code is compatible with the third code if the first code is incompatible with the second code.

As for Claim 117: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein a the database stores a second code, a second address and a third address for each of the second points.

As for Claim 118: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein determining the compatibility includes determining if the first address is compatible with any of the second address.

As for Claim 120: Sansone further discloses the method including storing, at the database, at least one additional functional property code associated with the second point (e.g. a corporation mailroom).

As for Claim 121: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first functional property code is compatible with the second functional property code if the first code is compatible with the at least one of the second codes.

As for Claim 125: Sansone further discloses the method including receiving at least one additional functional property code associated with the first address, such that the first address has multiple associated first functional property codes (see Supra multiple second points).

As for Claim 126: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first functional

property code is compatible with the second code if each of the functional codes is

compatible with at least one of the second codes.

As for Claim 127: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the transportation

network is a parcel delivery network.

As for Claim 128, Sansone discloses a system comprising:

a first point operable to obtain and send a first address and a first functional

property code;

a processor coupled to the first point, the processor programmed to:

store a second functional property code in database, a second address and a third

address associated with the second point (see Figs. 4 and 7; col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line

56; col. 7, line 48 – col. 9, line 9);

receive from the database the first address and the first functional property code;

determine if the first address is compatible with the second address (see Id.);

determine if the first functional property code is compatible with the second

functional property code if the first and second addresses are compatible (see Supra

Figs. and columns); and

generate the third address (e.g. forwarding address) to the first point if the first

functional property code is compatible with the second one (see Id.).

As for Claim 129: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the second address includes a partial postal address.

As for Claim 130: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the second address is compatible with the third address.

As for Claim 131: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first address includes part of the second address (in case the first and second address are both in the same city).

As for Claim 133: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the second point includes the destination point (see Id.).

As for Claim 135: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first address is compatible with the second address if the first address matches part of the second address.

As for Claim 136: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first functional property code (Unique code in Sansone) is compatible with the second functional code if the first functional property code matches the second functional property code.

As for Claim 144: Sansone further discloses the system including storing the second code, a second address and a third address for each of the a plurality of second points.

As for Claim 145: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the database is operable to determine if the first code is compatible with the third code if the first code is incompatible with the second code.

As for Claim 147: Sansone further discloses the system including storing, at the database, at least one additional functional property code associated with the second point (e.g. a corporation mailroom).

As for Claim 148: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first functional property code is compatible with the second functional property code if the first code is compatible with the at least one of the second codes.

As for Claim 152: Sansone further discloses the system including receiving at least one additional functional property code associated with the first address, such that the first address has multiple associated first functional property codes (see Supra multiple second points).

As for Claim 153: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the first functional property code is compatible with the second code if each of the functional codes is compatible with at least one of the second codes.

As for Claim 154: Sansone further discloses the system, wherein the transportation network is a parcel delivery network.

As for Claim 155, Sansone discloses a method comprising:

obtaining a first address and a first functional property code associated with a first point (see Figs. 4 and 7; col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line 56; col. 7, line 48 – col. 9, line 9);

determining whether to use the stored code or an alternative code as a first code

based on whether a user provides the alternative code (in case the user provides the

change of address form);

storing a second functional property code, a second address and a third address

associated with a second point (see Id.);

determining if the first address is compatible with the second address (see Id.);

determining if the first functional property code is compatible with the second

functional property code if the first and second addresses are compatible (see Supra

Figs. and columns); and

sending the third address (e.g. forwarding address) to the first point if the first

functional property code is compatible with the second one (see Id.).

As for Claim 156: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the stored code

includes a default property code associated with the first point.

As for Claim 157: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein obtaining the first

address and the stored code includes: receiving the first address from the user; and

accessing the stored code from a memory.

As for Claim 158: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein determining whether

to use the stored code or the alternative code is based on whether a prefix is provided

for the first address, and wherein the alternative code includes prefix.

As for Claim 159: Sansone further discloses the method including routing an object to

the second point (destination) based on the third address (forwarding address).

As for Claim 162: Sansone further discloses the method including retrieving an object from the second point based on the third address (in case the object was sent to the former address, it must be inherently retrieved and forwarded to the new forwarding address).

As for Claim 163: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the second address includes a partial postal address.

As for Claim 164: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the second address is compatible with the third address.

As for Claim 165: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first address includes part of the second address (in case the first and second address are both in the same city).

As for Claim 166: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the third address includes a pseudo-address (e.g. mailroom number in Supra columns).

As for Claim 167: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the first point includes an origin point (see Supra columns).

As for Claim 168: Sansone further discloses the method, wherein the second point includes the destination point (see Id.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9)   Claims 19-22, 30, 33, 59-60, 63, 68-71, 83-85, 95-96, 110-111, 114, 119, 122, 137-138, 146, and 149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sansone in view of Wheeler et al. (US 2002/0032623).

Sansone discloses the invention as recited above but does not expressly

discloses the subject matter of Claims 19-22, 30, 33, 59-60, 63, 68-71, 83-85, 95-96,

110-111, 114, 119, 122, 137-138, 146, and 149.

Wheeler et al. teaches, for a method and apparatus for mail management, that

the method and apparatus includes sending a no match code or notifying the user of the

no match if the codes are not compatible; and detecting signals from a keyboard and in

a display menu (see Figs. for the computer system).

Since Wheeler et al. and Sansone are both from the same field of endeavor, the

purpose disclosed by Wheeler et al. would have been well recognized in the pertinent

field of Sansone.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art, to send a no match code or notify the user of the

no match and detect signals from the computer system, as taught by Wheeler et al., for

the purpose of providing computer interface supplying the users a user friendly interface

for filtering, queuing, managing, mapping, tracking, and redirecting mail items.

10) Claims 12, 23-27, 34-35, 50, 61, 64-65, 72-73, 98-99, 112, 115-116, 123-124,

139-143, and 150-151 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sansone.

Sansone discloses the invention as recited earlier, but does not specifically

discloses the subject matter in Claims 12, 23-27, 34-35, 50, 61, 64-65, 72-73, 98-99,

112, 115-116, 123-124, 139-143, and 150-151.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of

design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention such that As

for the data base is co-located with the first point, the original point functional property

code and the destination point functional property code(s) must be compared for the

compatibility in various ways, as claimed by the Applicant (i.e. third address, fourth

address, multiple codes, negated, mandatory, etc.) and generating the code based on

the optical recognition of the object (e.g. barcode) because Applicant has not disclosed

that the above cited various means of determining compatibility between the original

and destination functional property codes and means for obtaining the code provide an

advantage, are used for a particular purpose, or solve a stated problem. One of

ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to

perform equally well with the Sansone because the Sansone can determine whether the

original point functional code(s) is compatible with the destination point functional

property code(s); obtain the information via the GUI; and show that the OCR can obtain

the information with respect to the object so as to generate the functional property code

instead of obtaining the information via GUI.

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify

Sansone to obtain the invention as specified in claims 12, 23-27, 34-35, 50, 61, 64-65,

72-73, 98-99, 112, 115-116, 123-124, 139-143, and 150-151.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Richard Woo whose telephone number is 703-308-
7830. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM -5:00
PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 703-308-2702. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Richard Woo
Patent Examiner
AU 3629
November 29, 2004

JOHN G. WEISS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600